

**REMARKS**

Claims 74, 77, 78 and 80 have been cancelled in this response. Claims 1-73 and 75 have been previously cancelled. Applicants reserve the right to file a continuation or divisional application directed to the subject matter of one or more of the cancelled claims. Claims 76 and 79 have been amended in this response. Claim 76 was amended to incorporate the subject matter of previously pending claim 74. Claim 79 was amended to be dependent from claim 76. Support for the amendments to claim 76 and 79 can be found throughout the specification and in the claims as previously presented. Claims 81-83 were indicated as allowable. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 76, 79, and 81-84 would be pending. No new matter has been added.

Applicants address herein each issue raised in the Office Action of August 5, 2010.

**I. The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Should be Withdrawn**

Claims 74, 77, 78 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Karsten, *Hybridoma*, 1995, 14:37-44 ("Karsten"). According to the Office Action, Karsten allegedly discloses a "monoclonal antibody which specifically binds both anomeric forms of the TF alpha and TF beta antigens, which is the same binding specificity as indicated in the instant specification on page 6, lines 16-18." Office Action at p. 2, last paragraph. The Office Action admits that Karsten does not "teach that the antibody has the same hypervariable regions as the instant recognition molecule," but the Examiner states that the molecules appear to be "the same in terms of epitope binding absent a showing of unobvious differences." *Id.*

Applicants respectfully disagree with these contentions.

Nonetheless, solely to expedite prosecution and not in acquiescence to this rejection,

Applicants have cancelled claims 74, 77, 78 and 80 herein. Therefore, the rejection is rendered moot and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

## **II. Objection to Dependent Claims 76, 79 and 84 Should be Withdrawn**

Claims 76, 79 and 84 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Office Action indicates that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, Applicants have been amended to incorporate the limitations of previous claim 76, 79 and 84 and thus, as indicated in the Office Action, Applicants believe that these claims are in condition for immediate allowance.


### III. Conclusion

Applicants believe that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request allowance thereof. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if that would be helpful in resolving any issues.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-5071.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/5/10

  
By: Thomas A. Haag, Ph.D, Esq.  
Reg. No. 47,621

Fanelli Strain & Haag PLLC  
Customer No. 0091436  
1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: 202.621.1840